

## Portland State University PDXScholar

---

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

6-12-1986

### Meeting Notes 1986-06-12

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1986-06-12 " (1986). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. Paper 83.

[http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact/83](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/83)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).



**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Agenda

Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
Date: June 12, 1986  
Day: Thursday  
Time: 7:30 a.m.  
Place: Metro, Conference Room 330

- \*1. MEETING REPORT OF MAY 8, 1986 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- \*2. REGIONAL COMMENTS ON PROPOSED SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- \*#3. FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF TRI-MET SERVICE CUTS AND TAX PROPOSAL - DISCUSSION - Andy Cotugno.

\*Material Enclosed.

#Available at Meeting.

NEXT JPACT MEETING: JULY 10, 1986 - 7:30 A.M.

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: May 8, 1986

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Larry Cole, Tom Bispham (alternate), Vern Veysey, Bob Bothman (alternate), Dick Pokornowski, Marv Woidyla, George Van Bergen, Bill Robertson (alternate), Pauline Anderson, Robert Schumacher, Margaret Strachan and Ron Thom

Guests: Ted Spence, Mary Volm, Ed Hardt and Rick Kuehn, ODOT; G.B. Arrington, Lee Hames and Bob Post, Tri-Met; Steve Dotterer and Grace Crunican, City of Portland; Peter Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council; Rosalind Daniels, City of Oregon City; Gil Mallery, IRC of Clark County; and Geraldine Ball, DJB, Inc.

Staff: Rick Gustafson, Executive Officer; and Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Bill Pettis, Keith Lawton, Peg Henwood, Karen Thackston and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

### MEETING REPORT OF APRIL 10, 1986

The Meeting Report of the April 10 JPACT meeting was approved as written.

### TRI-MET REVENUE PROPOSAL

Chairman Waker introduced and welcomed Bill Robertson to JPACT as alternate representative from the Tri-Met Board.

A draft position paper on the Tri-Met revenue proposal was introduced for JPACT discussion. Andy Cotugno highlighted the paper which provided background information on Tri-Met's financial situation, its needs, the funding alternatives explored, staff's conclusions on cost-efficiency, and recommendations for JPACT consideration. Andy Cotugno suggested that the revenue increase is the proper direction to follow in the short term. He stated that cost savings could be realized over the long term by improved efficiency, but that immediate action is needed to raise revenues. He emphasized the need to support the Tri-Met Board.

Bill Robertson added that the Tri-Met Board's recent effort have been twofold: 1) reviewing and reassessing the budget; and 2) reaching out to the public and business community of the tri-county area to discuss

the revenue-raising proposal. He indicated there was no "quick fix" inasmuch as the vast majority of the agency's expenses relate to personnel. An enormous service reduction would be in order to meet a needed 10 percent savings.

Chairman Waker stressed the need for this policy group to plan a regional road system around mass transit, encouraging JPACT support for a revenue increase.

Dick Pokornowski, on behalf of the City of Vancouver, stated that his jurisdiction would not be supportive of the revenue increase inasmuch as they feel that Tri-Met has not demonstrated the need that substantiates its request, that it has not operated efficiently, and that it needs to do some cost-cutting internally.

In response, Bill Robertson reviewed Tri-Met's cost-cutting measures and actions to improve productivity over the past three years.

Commissioner Strachan related that the Blue Ribbon Committee findings determined, after a great deal of analysis, that Tri-Met needs more funding. While not everyone in the region is served by Tri-Met, she noted that it is clear that it is an invaluable service that reduces the demand on road dollars and that we should be supportive of its needs.

Commissioner Veysey felt that Recommendation No. 2, supporting a new revenue measure, embodied the statement of Recommendation No. 1, supporting a strong transit system, and should be deleted. He thought that Recommendation No. 1 would represent an overall statement of support. Chairman Waker indicated that even though the exact amount of revenue Tri-Met needs isn't known, Recommendation No. 2 should be supported as it encourages the Tri-Met Board to implement a measure which provides for the needed level of service.

A discussion followed on whether or not the Tri-Met Board has given consideration to a "Sunset Clause" on an income tax, making it more palatable to the public. Bill Robertson responded that such a clause had been considered, but the majority of the Board were negative. He added that it will be discussed again before the budget is adopted on June 30.

Mayor Woidyla informed the Committee that the cities of Multnomah County would not support a personal income tax and that its backlash would be felt at the polls.

Mayor Cole indicated that the cities of Washington County also would not be supportive of the proposed income tax.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend JPACT support of the Tri-Met revenue proposal (JPACT Position Paper). In discussion on

JPACT

May 8, 1986

Page 3

the motion, Tom Bispham of DEQ cited the importance of air quality as a critical element of the mass transit goals and asked that a statement to that effect be incorporated in the "Summary and Conclusion" and "Recommendation" sections of the Position Paper. It was then moved and seconded to amend the motion to include such references. The amendment CARRIED.

It was moved and seconded to amend the Position Paper by deleting Recommendation No. 2. In discussion on the proposed amendment, Bob Bothman indicated ODOT's support of the increased revenue and felt that it is prudent to state that there is a problem in funding which needs to be addressed. The amendment FAILED.

A roll-call vote on the amended main motion was as follows:

Ayes: Members Bill Robertson, Pauline Anderson, Bob Bothman, Tom Bispham, Bob Schumacher, Margaret Strachan, Ron Thom, George Van Bergen, and Richard Waker

Nays: Members Larry Cole, Dick Pokornowski, Marvin Woidyla and Vern Veysey

The motion CARRIED.

#### RETIREMENT OF ED HARDT

Chairman Waker noted the upcoming retirement of Ed Hardt of ODOT in July and introduced Rick Kuehn who will be working with JPACT in the same capacity.

#### AMENDING THE FY 1986 TIP TO INCLUDE AN UPDATED PROGRAM OF PROJECTS USING SECTION 9 FUNDS

Andy Cotugno explained that the total Section 9 allocation for Tri-Met is allocated on a formula basis and amounts to \$13.3 million. Tri-Met intends to purchase 50 buses annually with these funds.

Andy then reviewed the other components of the Section 9 grant application.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of Resolution No. 86-647 to amend the FY 1986 Transportation Improvement Program to include an updated program of projects using Section 9 funds. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

#### POSITION PAPER ON FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The Position Paper defines the region's position and options on federal transportation funding as it relates to the new Surface Transportation Act. Andy Cotugno highlighted the outline and discussed the

possibility that Congress could adopt a one-year extension of its present Surface Transportation Act, but cited the importance of reaching agreement on a Position Paper at this time.

The consensus was to incorporate the following into the Position Paper:

Under IV-D. "Consolidate the FAI, FAI-4R, and FAP highway funding categories in order to maximize state flexibility while maintaining the overall funding level without cuts."

Under IV-G. "Consolidate FAI, FAI-4R, and FAP into single category."

Under VI-C. Delete #2. "Remove quarterly obligation limits/targets."

The Committee agreed that flexibility in the use of funds needed to be stressed, but not as a substitute for receiving real dollars.

#### STATUS REPORT ON SIX-YEAR PROGRAM UPDATE

A handout was distributed by ODOT on its current recommendations and priorities for the Six-Year Program Update. Decisions are still pending on the Interstate projects.

Two public hearings on the Modernization Program have been held and formal recommendations should be submitted to the Oregon Transportation Commission at its June 17 meeting.

In response to questioning by Mayor Cole on the preliminary engineering for the Farmington Road project, he was assured by Bob Bothman and Ted Spence that, if the levy in Washington County proved successful, there would be no reason to hold up the project.

Commissioner Anderson emphasized the fact that funding for Multnomah County outside the City of Portland is \$500,000 over the next six years compared to Washington and Clackamas Counties at \$46 million.

#### FIRST-QUARTER ADJUSTMENTS TO THE TIP

In compliance with the adopted TIP Project Management Guidelines, a copy of the first-quarter TIP adjustments was provided for the Committee's information.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson  
Don Carlson  
JPACT Members




**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Memorandum

Date: June 5, 1986

To: JPACT

From:  Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Regarding: ODOT Six-Year Highway Improvement Program

ODOT is nearing completion of their Six-Year Program update. They have released the "Final Draft" document and will hear comments at the June 17 meeting of the Transportation Commission. Adoption will be considered at the July 15 meeting.

In response to the recommendations contained in the "Final Draft," attached are proposed comments to be forwarded to the Transportation Commission. It is recommended that JPACT adopt these comments and present these concerns at the June 17 meeting.

For your reference, included in the attached material are the priorities adopted by the region with notations regarding ODOT's "Final Draft" recommendations. When a dollar amount is indicated, the project is recommended for construction. If "DEV" is indicated, ODOT is committed to construction at an unspecified later date and engineering and perhaps right-of-way acquisition will proceed. If "RECON" is indicated, ODOT will begin engineering and feasibility studies to better define the scope of the project and to provide sufficient information for consideration of a construction commitment at a later date.

ACC:lmk

Attachments

PORTLAND REGION COMMENTS ON  
PROPOSED SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

June, 1986

- . ODOT is to be commended for its effort in preparing the Six-Year Highway Program, in following an open process, and for listening to local concerns. The Department has been responsive in selecting projects for funding from amongst the high priority projects adopted by the Portland region rather than the many other possible good candidates.
- . In general, the projects selected are consistent with adopted regional priorities (see Attachment A) but several project specific comments are appropriate:
  - 1) I-84 from 181st to Sundial is not identified in the Six-Year Program for construction (1987-1992) despite the fact that a portion will be funded with Interstate funds (FAI) which will only be provided through 1990 after which the program will expire. ODOT should initiate project development and when the FAI portion of the project has been identified, consider advancing that portion of the project to take advantage of the available FAI funds.
  - 2) The I-84 Arata Road Bridge (at the 238th Avenue interchange) is programmed for replacement in 1990. This should be done consistent with the project scope for the overall I-84 improvement project described above.
  - 3) The proposed program identifies the I-5/Stafford interchange for construction and the I-5/Highway 217/Kruse Way interchange for development only. The high priority projects for the region are the reverse of this proposal because of the importance of the I-5/Highway 217/Kruse Way interchange to the full Westside highway system and the severity of the existing traffic problem. ODOT should consider funding the I-5/Highway 217/Kruse Way project no later than 1992.
  - 4) It is recommended that ODOT consider funding a "reconnaissance and feasibility" study on the following top regional priorities:
    - a. Sandy Boulevard - 112th to 238th
    - b. 223rd - Halsey to Stark
    - c. Highway 217 Ramp Metering

If ODOT concurs with the above comments, all of the top priority projects adopted by the region over the past year will be addressed in some fashion. In those cases where ODOT chose not to fund construction, at least assistance will be available from ODOT in better specifying the scope of the other projects for consideration at a later date.



- . As shown on Attachment B, the overall distribution of funds for projects in the Portland region appears appropriate (@ 31 percent). However, in consideration of the specific categories of funds, this may not in fact be the case. The overwhelming factor that skews the picture is the predominance of funds in the Portland region to complete the Interstate system (FAI funds @ 85 percent). Because of this, the remainder of the funds are heavily skewed toward the rest of the state. FAI funds are only available for the next four years to complete the system -- a task initiated over 20 years ago and one that has already been accomplished elsewhere in the state.

Within the other funding categories, the funding available for safety and preservation-type activities (HBR, HES, FAP, FAS, and state funds) are the most heavily skewed to the rest of the state (Region 1 = 15 percent). This distribution is probably appropriate since ODOT is responsible for a very large number of miles elsewhere in the state.

The Interstate-4R category appears well balanced (@ 32 percent) because it is provided for a combination of preservation activities needed for the rest of the state and modernization projects needed in the growing urban areas like the Portland region.

The State Modernization Program appears the most problematic (with the Portland area @ 22 percent) in light of the fact that these funds are most important to promote and serve growth and economic development. The Portland area is where most of the growth has occurred for the past five years (65 percent of statewide growth) and where it is most likely that job growth can in fact be realized in response to a highway investment (see Attachment C).

- . In light of these comments, it is recommended that:
  - 1) ODOT should recognize the remainder of the region's top priorities as high candidates for the remaining \$22 million of State Modernization funds.
  - 2) The OTC should establish criteria for release of these funds to specific projects when the project is needed to proceed as part of a larger public and/or private effort and when the other public/private commitments have been established.
  - 3) If a convention center is approved by the voters, the OTC members should consider the necessary transportation improvements as eligible for the remaining \$22 million of State Modernization funds.
  - 4) ODOT should consider such factors as where the funds are generated and where job creation has the greatest likelihood of occurring in response to a highway improvement when allocating the remaining State Modernization funds and when proposing future State Modernization programs.

old

- . As shown on Attachment B, the overall distribution of funds for projects in the Portland region appears appropriate (@ 31 percent). However, in consideration of the specific categories of funds, this may not in fact be the case. The overwhelming factor that skews the picture is the predominance of funds in the Portland region to complete the Interstate system (FAI funds @ 85 percent). Because of this, the remainder of the funds are heavily skewed toward the rest of the state. FAI funds are only available for the next four years to complete the system -- a task initiated over 20 years ago and one that has already been accomplished elsewhere in the state.

Within the other funding categories, the funding available for safety and preservation-type activities (HBR, HES, FAP, FAS, and state funds) are the most heavily skewed to the rest of the state (Region 1 = 15 percent). This distribution is probably appropriate since ODOT is responsible for a very large number of miles elsewhere in the state.

The Interstate-4R category appears well balanced (@ 32 percent) because it is provided for a combination of preservation activities needed for the rest of the state and modernization projects needed in the growing urban areas like the Portland region.

The State Modernization Program appears the most problematic (with the Portland area @ 22 percent) in light of the fact that these funds are most important to promote and serve growth and economic development. The Portland area is where most of the growth has occurred for the past five years (65 percent of statewide growth) and where it is most likely that job growth can in fact be realized in response to a highway investment (see Attachment C).

- . In light of these comments, it is recommended that:
  - 1) ODOT should recognize the remainder of the region's top priorities as high candidates for the remaining \$22 million of State Modernization funds.
  - 2) The OTC should establish criteria for release of these funds to specific projects when the project is needed to proceed as part of a larger public and/or private effort and when the other public/private commitments have been established.
  - 3) ODOT should consider such factors as where the funds are generated and where job creation has the greatest likelihood of occurring in response to a highway improvement when allocating the remaining State Modernization funds and when proposing future State Modernization programs.

I-205/Sunnyside Interchange		
Phase 1 - Offramps	\$ 0.5 million	.38
Phase 2 - Reconstruction	7.4	DEY.
I-205 Bikepath - Sunnyside to Main	0.65	1.31
I-5/I-205 Auxiliary Lanes	1.5	—
I-5/Kruse Way Interchange (including Bangy Road)	7.0	DEY.
I-5/Wilsonville Interchange	<u>4.0</u>	3.85
SUBTOTAL	\$21.05 million	

c. Washington County

I-5/Highway 217 Interchange	\$ 6.0 million	DEV.
I-5 Auxiliary Lanes N of I-205	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>

SUBTOTAL	\$11.3 million
----------	----------------

TOTAL RECOMMENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION	\$69.55 million
------------------------------------	-----------------

3. Interstate-4R Priorities for Development

I-5/Capitol Highway Interchange	\$ 4.5 million	DEV.
I-5/Terwilliger Curves	<u>12.45</u>	<u>RECON.</u>

Balance of I-84 Reconstruction - East of 181st	* 1	DEV.
--	-----	------

I-5/Interchange in the Stafford-Boeckman Area	<u>10.5</u>	(STAFFORD) <sup>†</sup> 5.67m.
---	-------------	--------------------------------

TOTAL RECOMMENDED FOR DEVELOPMENT	\$27.45 million
-----------------------------------	-----------------

---

\*Funding in excess of that provided under "1" above.

1Upgrading of I-84 from 181st to Sundial Road involves reconstruction to Interstate standards, provision of four travel lanes with ability to expand to six, elimination of hazardous curves and obstacles, and upgrading of interchanges to be funded with a combination of "Interstate" and "Interstate-4R" funds. The elements of this project recommended for implementation include all "Interstate" funded elements plus the I-84/238th interchange if "Interstate-4R" funded. In addition, a new interchange at 223rd is identified for consideration. The remainder of the project is recommended for development with implementation to be pursued at a later date.

5064C/435

# ODOT RECOMMENDATION

## PROJECTS ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN THE ODOT SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

NE Portland Highway 82nd - I-205 at 60th	\$ 1.6 million 2.2	\$1.33m. DEV.
Marine Drive at BNRR	7.0	5.44
Sunset Highway at Zoo	3.0	2.7
Highway 224/212 - Ross Island Bridge to U.S. 26 Reconnaissance	0.5	} RECON
Phase 1 Construction (such as 224/Harrison interchange and 212 climbing lane)	5.0	
US 26 - Cornelius Pass	4.8	4.715
US 26 - Cornell	5.2	5.3
US 26 - 185th	5.0	DEV.
Highway 217 at 99W	4.6	DEV.
Scholls Ferry Road	3.8	1.56
Farmington Road (to 185th)	4.6	DEV.
257th Extension (Graham Road)	1.7	DEV.
State Street (to include application for \$0.4m of HES funds)	0.3-0.7	.7
Highway 217 Ramp Metering	0.4	-
TV Highway Reconnaissance	0.3	DEV.
Sandy Boulevard - 122nd to 238th	4.7	(@201/223) .32
TOTAL STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM	\$54.7-\$55.1 million	

5064C/435

## RURAL RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE 3-COUNTY AREA

Hwy 213 - Spangler Hill	\$1.4m.
U.S. 26 - Wildwood to ZigZag	4.8
Wilson River Hwy	4.0

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS  
RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN THE  
ODOT SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

A. Recommended for Implementation

N.E. 181st/Airport Way

Unit I	\$ 0.62 million	} \$3.5
*Unit II	3.88	
*223rd Avenue Halsey to Stark	1.5	-
*Johnson Creek Boulevard Extension	1.8	1.8
*Tualatin - Sherwood Road	4.5	RECON
Baseline Road	3.9	RECON

SUBTOTAL

\$16.2 million

\*Top priority projects for implementation.

B. Recommended for Consideration for funding now or future allocations or recommended for development:

S.E. 9th/Division/SPRR	\$ 0.15 million	-
Beavercreek Road	2.6	-
Cornelius Pass Road	1.45	-
Shute Road	1.49	1.0
Marine Drive - Portland Road to Slough	2.3	-
Harbor Drive	2.6	-
Glisan Street - 203rd to 223rd	1.25	-
37th Avenue - RR Avenue to Highway 224	.68	-

\$12.52 million

# ATTACHMENT B

## Proposed Six-Year Highway Improvement Program Funding Distribution

	<u>Region 1</u>	<u>Balance of State</u>	<u>Total</u>
Interstate	\$ 87.94 m. 84.6%	\$ 16.0 m.	\$103.94 m.
Interstate-4R	84.53 m. 32.3%	177.43 m.	261.96 m.
State Modernization*	46.669 m. 35.7%	130.666 m.	177.335 m.
Balance of Program	50.578 m. 15.3%	279.24 m.	329.818 m.
Total	\$269.717 m. 30.9%	\$603.336 m.	\$873.053 m.
Population*	1,130,450 42.2%		2,675,800
*3-County Metro Area State Modernization Population	\$ 38.635 m. 21.8% 1,078,000 40.3%		

## ATTACHMENT C

Population and Employment Growth  
1980-1985

	<u>Population</u>		<u>Growth</u>	<u>% of State</u>
	<u>1980</u>	<u>1985</u>		
Clackamas Co.	241,911	248,200		
Multnomah Co.	562,647	561,800		
Washington Co.	245,860	268,000		
Subtotal	1,050,418	1,078,000	+27,582	65%
Columbia	35,646	36,100		
Hood River	15,835	16,350		
Region 1	1,101,899	1,130,450	+28,551	67%
Oregon	2,633,156	2,675,800	+42,644	



B. Increase Revenues -- The currently available revenue alternatives allowed under the Tri-Met statute are limited and not very attractive:

1. Payroll Tax -- This is at the statutory maximum of .6 percent and would require a special session of the Legislature to increase the limit in time to meet the need by October. Furthermore, this would result in an increased burden on the business community, contrary to recommendations that their share of the burden be reduced.
2. Business License Fees -- The Tri-Met statute provides that imposition of a business license must be accompanied by removal of the payroll tax on that business. As such, an across-the-board business license fee would be a very large tax in order to both replace the payroll tax and raise the needed \$10-\$12 million. The end result is simply a shift in tax burden within the business community.

A more selective business license fee (such as a fee on paid parking, a fee on the sale of petroleum products or a fee on new and used auto sales) results in a heavy burden on a very narrow segment of the business community. In addition, the petroleum and auto alternatives are constitutionally clouded and subject to the uncertainty and delay of a court challenge.

3. Property Tax -- Property tax relief has been at the forefront of Oregon politics and further increases appear inappropriate.
4. Income Tax -- This is a new tax and would involve a major effort to implement the necessary collection mechanism, but it would result in a better balance of the cost of transit service between individuals and businesses.

#### Summary and Conclusion

Adopting an income tax provides a means of buying time for the new Tri-Met Board to improve the cost-efficiency of the agency and pursue other revenue alternatives with the Legislature while averting a financial crisis and disruption in service.

1. A drastic cut in the level of transit service is not appropriate and contrary to regional objectives regarding highway operations, personal mobility and air quality; this is not an acceptable short- or long-term option.
2. Cost savings through improved efficiencies may be a long-term option, but cannot be implemented to correct short-term financial problems.

Tri-Met FY 87 Budget Proposal  
Overview and Comments

Service Cuts

- . Reduce service hours by 5 percent - \$1.6 million savings.
- . Cuts are based upon cutting least productive service, resulting in greater cuts in off-peak and weekend service, including elimination of seven lines, all owl service plus various other curtailments.
- . Reduce "extra-board" from 17 percent to 10 percent; reduce on-street supervision; results in 3-4 percent random missed pull-outs and 15 percent drop in on-time route performance.
- . Cut service for Special Needs Transportation from \$2.8 to \$2.4 million.
- . Retain opening of LRT.

Maintenance and Operations Cost

- . Assumes reduced absenteeism.
- . Assumes reduced workers' compensation claims by 50 percent to \$1.9 million.
- . Eliminate Transit Police (\$364,000).
- . Reduce maintenance staff and materials (\$927,000).
- . Reduce liability insurance through increased self-insurance (\$1.15 million).
- . Purchase of diesel fuel @ 40¢/gallon (10¢/gallon error - \$0.5 million).
- . Retains fleet replacement.

Administration and Planning

- . Cut staff and consultants for accounting, auditing, parts control, and management information (\$400,000).
- . Eliminate fare inspectors required for Fareless Square (\$92,000).
- . Elimination of staff and consultant for strategic planning, long-range planning and coordination and capital project development (\$340,000).
- . Reduction in marketing staff advertising and customer response staff (\$1,300,000).
- . Retains pension payment at \$2.4 million.

### Working Capital

- . Over the past five years, Tri-Met has spent \$20 million more revenue than they collected; this budget continues this trend by reducing working capital by \$5.2 million from \$7.4 to \$2.2 million. This resource would therefore not be available for the following year's budget.

### Summary

- . 5 percent cut in service (in addition to 14 percent cut since 1982).
- . 30 percent cut in administrative costs.
- . 70 percent cut in working capital.
- . Requires extraordinary action to stay in balance, including:
  - 1) significant drop in workmens' compensation and absenteeism
  - 2) diesel fuel remaining low
  - 3) claims against self-insurance remaining in line with past experience
  - 4) modest drop in ridership

### Comments

- 1) Express concern that the financial problem is not solved -- the "balanced budget" is predicated on several key optimistic assumptions and \$5 million of working capital. If this trend is continued, the consequences next year and beyond may be more severe.
- 2) Express concern about short-term impacts on the reliability of service due to cuts in maintenance, the extra-board, scheduled overtime and road supervisors.
- 3) Express concern about the 1-2 year impact on service when further cuts will clearly be necessary without new revenue.
- 4) Request the Tri-Met Board to work with the region over the next three months to establish the scope of transit service to operate in the next five years and define a legislative agenda for 1987.

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 6/12/86 — 7:30 am

NAME	AFFILIATION
M- <u>Merv Weidyle</u>	<u>Cities of Multnomah Co</u>
M- <u>LARRY COLE</u>	<u>" " WASHINGTON CO.</u>
G- <u>Zed Jensen</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
M- <u>FRED HANSEN</u>	<u>DEQ</u>
MA- <u>Bob Bohman</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
M- <u>Ron Thom</u>	<u>Cities of Clackamas Cty</u>
M- <u>George (Van) Bergen</u>	<u>Metro</u>
M- <u>RICHARD WAKER</u>	<u>METRO</u>
G- <u>Geraldine L. Ball</u>	<u>CWFF + DJB, Inc.</u>
G- <u>Peter F Fry</u>	<u>CEIC</u>
G- <u>MISIE LARSEN</u>	<u>MULCO</u>
G- <u>Gary Spanovich</u>	<u>Clackamas County</u>
G- <u>Rick Kuehn</u>	<u>ODOT - Region 1</u>
G- <u>GRACE CEUNICAN</u>	<u>Pdx</u>
S- <u>Bill Pettis</u>	<u>Metro</u>
G- <u>G.I. Murray</u>	<u>I.R.C.</u>
G- <u>Keith Abola</u>	<u>WSDOT</u>
G- <u>STEPHEN IWATA</u>	<u>PORTLAND</u>
G- <u>Lee James</u>	<u>TRI-MET</u>
S- <u>Richard Hardman</u>	<u>Metro</u>
M- <u>Margaret Straden</u>	<u>City of Portland</u>
S- <u>Karen Thackston</u>	<u>Metro</u>
G- <u>Bob Post</u>	<u>TRI-MET</u>

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

NAME

AFFILIATION

G- Donnie Hays

Wash. Co. Commissioner

G- Julia Someroy

Strachan: City of Portla

S- Andrew Catugno

Metro

M- Wes Myltenback

Metro

S- Rick Gustafson

Metro

U